Pariahs, Strangers and Court-Jews: A Conceptual Clarification*

Werner J. Cahnman
New School for Social Research

The terms "Pariah" and "Pariahvolk" *have been introduced into the sociological vocabulary by Max Weber and used primarily to characterize the status of the Jewish people. But Max Weber has neither clarified the ideal-typical character of the concept nor demonstrated its historical applicability. Subsequently, the term has been confounded with the term "stranger," as used by Toennies, Brentano and especially Simmel. Recently, Lewis A. Coser has applied both terms interchangeably and subsumed them under the general title, "The Alien as a Servant of Power." In addition, Coser has extended the latter term to an entirely non-"Pariah" population; namely, the Christian boys pressed into the Corps of the Janissaries in the Ottoman Empire. The following deliberations attempt to untangle these varied understandings of the term "Pariah" and related terms and to show that the term "stranger" retains its validity. In a final paragraph, conclusions are drawn as to the relation of Jews to governments in the changed circumstances of the post-emancipatory period.*

In a sociological investigation of the relations between Jews and Christians over the centuries, the concepts of the "Pariah," the "Stranger" and related concepts need to be reviewed and evaluated. In this context, the relations between Jews and sovereigns are of particular importance. At the same time, the question is raised as to how and to what extent sociological concepts are applicable to historical reality. It will be shown that it is the nature of historical phenomena that they have another side. A comparative analysis serves this multiple purpose.

A further reason for engaging in the evaluation is a recent paper by Prof. Lewis A. Coser (1972). In his paper, Coser elaborated on the topic of "The Alien as a Servant of Power," using as examples the Court-Jews of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and the Christian boys that were pressed in the Corps of the Janissaries in the Ottoman Empire. Coser considers the Jews of the middle ages as well as those of the absolutistic era as "wholly unprotected . . . communities of Pariahs" and characterizes them simultaneously as "prototypical strangers." About the Court-Jews he says further that they had been "raised from the depths" by the ruling princes of the time and, in an analogous passus, that they had been "lifted by the princes from their status as pariahs." Regarding the ex-Christian boys in the Corps of the Janissaries Coser uses the term "renegade"; for the totality of the phenomena under investigation he uses the term "alien" which he does not distinguish from the commonly used sociological concept of the "stranger." The ex-Christian boys and the Court-Jews are then subsumed under the concept of "aliens." Equipped with a vaguely indicated conceptual instrumentarium of this

*Paper delivered at the 63rd annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1974.

kind Coser engages in a "sociology with the hard work left out." Concrete phenomena are not critically investigated because they are not endowed with intrinsic interest: they are used to verify a hypothesis. In such a manner, Coser, while emphasizing superficial similarities,overlooks essential dissimilarities and is likely to spread confusion among his readers. The relations between Jewish subjects and Gentile sovereigns are part of the entire complex of Jewish-Gentile relations and must be pursued throughout the length and breadth of European history. If one intends to grasp their significance, he must analyze the concepts of the "Pariah" and the "stranger" as well as a number of related concepts and scrutinize them regarding their applicability to such phenomena as the *shtadlan*, the Court-Jew and the State banker.

The Concepts of the Pariah, the Millet and the Stranger

I am starting with Max Weber's concept of the "Pariah" which, not unlike other so-called ideal types of Weberian coinage, has been widely quoted and used without much deliberation as to its significance or its applicability. As one looks at the pertinent passages more closely, he will find that the concept is by no means unambiguous, namely:

1. The concept has been interpreted by Max Weber differently in different passages of his writings;
2. The concept has not been sufficiently clarified by Max Weber as far as the initial Indian context is concerned;
3. The applicability of the concept to the Jewish situation and possibly to other extra-Indian situations is open to doubt.

The third point is decisive in the present context, but the two preceding points cannot be entirely disregarded either.

ad 1. Weber's position is most clearly expressed in *Ancient Judaism* (Weber, 1952:3), where he says that a *Pariahvolk* is "a guest people that is ritually, formally or factually, separated from its environment." In *The Religion of India* (Weber, 1958: 12,13), he adds that Pariah peoples are "migratory peoples that are 'excluded from connubium and commensality' and considered as 'ritually unclean.' " Not only the "separateness" but also the "uncleanness" is emphasized at this point. In *Economy and Society* (Weber, 1968: II,493, translation slightly altered) Weber designates a *Pariahvolk* as "a distinctive hereditary social group lacking autonomous political organization and characterized by internal prohibitions against commensality and intermarriage originally founded upon magical, tabooistic, and ritual functioning on the one hand, and political and social disprivilege on the other hand." In *Economy and Society* (Weber, 1968: II, 933-34) he speaks of "specific occupational traditions," "belief in the ethnic community," "strict segregation from any avoidable personal intercourse" and a "legally precarious situation"; Weber continues that by virtue of their economic indispensability (Pariah peoples) are tolerated, indeed frequently privileged" and that they live "interspersed" in political communities. The Jews, he says, "are the most impressive historical example." The last-named quotation indicates the nature of Weber's interest because one can hardly maintain that the Indian Pariahs are "privileged."

Sigrist (Stammer, 1972:241; cf. Maier in the same volume:193) has pointed out that Weber does not restrict his attention to a few attributes and that he seems to consider an attribute at one time as necessary, at another time as dispensable. One

might add that Weber is not even sure as to whether he wishes to use the term Pariah "in the usual European sense" (Weber, 1958:13) or with reference to "what we know from India" (Weber, 1952:3). It appears that he leans toward the former interpretation because he designates the Jews as a "Pariah people," with the further comment that the designation "has little to do with the particular situation of the Pariah caste in India" (Weber, 1968:II, 493). Nevertheless, the comparison with the Indian Pariah caste can hardly be avoided, or else, the term should not have been chosen. I agree with Sigrist that it is hardly admissible to say that what we have here before us is an "ideal type" which rests on the imagined summation of attributes that need not be present in their totality in a concrete case. The concepts of "Pariah" and "*Pariahvolk*" obviously are not so much an "ideal type" concept but a "historical totality concept" or a "relatively historical concept" in Schelting's sense. One might even go further and agree with Hempel (Hempel, 1952:71 ff.) when he says that impure ideal types of his kind are not concepts, properly speaking, but theories.

Ad 2. It is not within my intention or competence to analyze the place of the Pariahs, or Parayan, within the social structure of India. However, the older as well as the newer literature which I have consulted (Dubois and Beauchamp, 1897:51-69; Stephen Fuchs, 1950: V-X,91,357,434; Thurston and Rangachari, 1909: 77-139, et al.) agrees that the Parayan are a low and despised caste within the hinduistic social system—not necessarily the lowest caste, as already Weber observed. They engage in low and menial tasks against a puny compensation, live from hand to mouth and in dirt and misery and their character and living conditions are believed to be immutably fixed. One can say that the designation of these people as ritually unclean is a mirror and consequence of the actual situation; the actual situation is subsequently sanctioned by ritual segregation. Fuchs considers it unlikely, for anthropological and anthropometric reasons, that the Parayan are the remnant of a subjected aboriginal population. That amounts to saying that the Parayan are not ethnic or religious strangers; they are included into the ethno-religious universe of Hinduism. Strangers are in India the Parsis. One gains the impression that the Parayan are a degraded proletariat, possibly representing a prototype of what Oscar Lewis has called "the culture of poverty." I must leave further elaboration at this point to the Indologists. I would, however, complement the diffuse formulations of Max Weber by the following definition:

The Pariahs are: 1) a low, despised and exploited caste, 2) which is considered unclean factually and ritually and 3) which therefore is excluded from connubium, commensality and each and every kind of personal contact and 4) whose members accept the exclusion as legitimate.

What we have before us, then, is not an ideal type, but a relatively historical real type.

Ad 3. It would seem more appropriate to refer to a mideastern model rather than to apply a phenomenon which is indigenous to India when it comes to the social history of the Jews of Europe. At the same time, such a model will serve to evaluate Coser's attempt to use the ex-Christian boys that were pressed into military service in the Ottoman Empire as a prime example for what may be meant by "aliens as servants of power." I am referring here to the concept of the *Millet*, as I have elaborated in the paper "Religion and Nationality" (Cahnman, 1964:271-280). I quote:

> The *Millet* may be defined as the peculiar political organization which gave to non-Moslem subjects of the Ottoman Empire the right to organize into communities possessing delegated political power under their own ecclesiastical chiefs. The head of the *Millet* was directly responsible to the state for the administration of all its subjects. Although the Millet lacked territorial cohesion and military power and had, therefore, to be protected by the ruling warrior caste, it formed in many respects an autonomous unit within the state. Yet, the members of the *Millet* were limited in their general citizenship by the fact that the laws of personal stature were based on religious sanctions.

Thus, the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople was the political head of the Greek *Millet*—the most important of them all because it represented the continuity with the Byzantine Empire which was now under Turkish sovereignty. The Greeks were not only indispensable commercially; the Phanariote families of Constantinople were the administrators and diplomats of the Ottoman Empire while military positions, to be sure, were closed to them. That hits closer to home than the example of the ex-Christian boys in the Corps of the Janissaries. Things go further back as far as the Jews are concerned. The *Resh-Galuta* (Prince of the Exile) was recognized as the legitimate head of the Jewish community by the Sassanid rulers and Arab Caliphs in Babylonia and Persia, and the basic idea that religion and ethnicity are merely two sides of one and the same thing harks back to models of the ancient Orient and to Biblical documentation. This model was congenial to the Jews, it was accepted, if ever so reluctantly, by the Emperors of Rome and it provided the underlying principle for the legal construction of Jewish existence in the middle ages.

Included in the concept of the *Millet* is the concept of the "stranger." The concept of the "stranger" has been elaborated repeatedly in the classic sociological literature, especially in Germany. It is to be found by Ludwig Gumplowicz (1883:211 ff.), by Lujo Brentano (1923:21, 214-15;369 *et passim*), by Ferdinand Toennies (1957:53, 75f., 168f.; 1971:288-317), and by Georg Simmel (1950:402-408). I am referring here chiefly to Toennies and Simmel. According to Toennies, the trader is always a stranger; he adds that even if he is not a stranger strictly speaking, he will be considered as one. The trader who leaves his own clan-community because he is prevented from trading among brothers, Toennies continues, is "the first thinking and free human being to appear in the normal development of human life" (1957:81; translation slightly altered); he is the protagonist of *Gesellschaft*, weighing advantage and disadvantage, separating means and end. Simmel has added a psychological dimension to the sociological concept of the "stranger" when he says that in him "distance becomes proximity"; the stranger is not so much "the wanderer who comes today and leaves tomorrow," but one "who comes today and stays tomorrow." The stranger who, as Toennies indicates (1957:169; following Henry Maine), does not need to be a recent migrant, lives in the midst of a native population, but belongs to another clan and serves another God. He becomes a neighbor but one who maintains his extended relations, so that indeed proximity is merged with distance: he turns out to be the "intermediary." I am using the term "intermediary" not exclusively microsociologically in Simmel's sense, who refers to a third person as intermediary between two others, but rather macrosociologically in the sense of Toennies, that is, as a commercial and cultural intermediary within a social structure. To be sure, others also have fulfilled these functions, but none as exclusively as the Jew, who

without support from a political homeland has lived always and everywhere on the periphery and consequently in mediation. The function of mediation has its two sides: on the one hand, the intermediary as an outsider is looked upon with suspicion; on the other hand, because he is an outsider, he is welcomed as a friend, a counsellor, an impartial judge. He is a neighbor, but he has the advantage of remoteness.

The "Pariahvolk" in Antiquity and in the Middle Ages

We must now return to the simplest of Max Weber's definitions of a *Pariahvolk*, namely that of "a guest people that is ritually, formally or factually, separated from its environment." In this restricted sense, the concept may be applicable to the Jewish situation, but it does not carry our understanding very far. To speak, as Max Weber does, of a "*Pariahvolk* that lives in a casteless environment" (Weber, 1952:5), would be equivalent to talking of Pariahs who are no Pariahs; historically speaking, the Pariah situation remains suspended in midair without the matrix of a caste society. Consequently, Max Weber admits that ritual separation, as distinguished from physical segregation, that is, exclusion from connubium and commensality, was at no time imposed on the Jews from the outside, as it was on the Pariahs in India. Rather the Jews enjoyed the status of an autonomous community, or a *politeuma*, in the Roman Empire. Theodor Mommsen (1885:487-552) sees in this fact the main reason for the aversion against them. Max Weber sees the main reason in Jewish exclusivity, that is, in their self-segregation: the Jews refused to participate in the meals of the Gentiles as they refused to participate in the cult of the divine emperor. That earned them the reputation of indulging in *odium generis humani*. But the Gentiles participated in the meals of the Jews and many joined Judaism as proselytes. What one can say is that the pagan authors whose diatribes have been preserved were "viewing with alarm" what was going on, namely, the attraction which Judaism held to many a searching mind among their contemporaries. The spectacle was irritating for a variety of reasons, not least, as Seneca put it, because it seemed that "the vanquished (had) given laws to the victors."

Moreover, if one disregards *ad hoc* definitions and adopts a more common understanding of the term "Pariah" which, by the way, is subtly implied in Max Weber's own argument, namely, that of a population of low position and prestige that is shunned and held in contempt by the remainder of the population, the name antedates the reality to which it refers by about a millenium. Far from considering themselves, or being considered by others, as persons of low caste, the Jews of the late antiquity called themselves "the People of God" and this all the more so as the Church proclaimed itself as "the true Israel." If a Jewish trait was minded by the Gentiles it was overweening pride rather than impotent resentment or servile submissiveness. One must agree with Julius Guttman (1925:195-223) when he says that a "plebejan or *Pariahvolk* ethic *vis-à-vis* native or foreign potentates can be observed neither among the prophets nor among the pharisees." Hans Gerth (Weber, 1952, Preface, XXIII) feels that Weber's terminology is "unfortunately lending itself to misconceptions"; Guttman considers the designation of the Jews as a *Pariahvolk* as factually incorrect. I happen to agree with both critics.

The degradation of the Jews—not in ritual but in socioeconomic terms—to the

lowly occupations of small-scale moneylending, pawnbroking and to the trade in used goods is a phenomenon of the high middle ages and was deepened in the newer centuries. The occupational structure of the Jewish communities remained diversified in the countries of the first Diaspora, that is, in the mediterranean area, until the late fifteenth century (Cahnman, 1965). The occupationl structure was more lopsided in the countries of the second Diaspora, that is, in western and northern Europe, yet the function which the Jews served in commerce and finance was highly appreciated until the period of the Crusades. In the core area of emerging Europe, the Carolingian Empire, the social position of the Jews was so elevated that the aggressive anti-Jewish campaign of Bishop Agobard of Lyon came to naught on account of the influence which the Jews wielded at the court of Emperor Louis the Pious. The bishop objected that the faithful accepted invitations to Jewish homes, that they preferred rabbinic sermons to those of their own clergy, that they celebrated the Jewish Shabbat rather than the Christian Sunday, that they accepted employment with Jews, especially in Jewish homes and vineyards. Agobard's Church looked upon the Jews not as despised Pariahs but as dangerous competitors (Zuckermann, 1970). The situation was slow to change. The Gothic statue of the Synagogue over the portal of the southern transept of the Munster at Strasbourg is veiled with blindness and her power is broken, but her bearing is noble, in stark contrast to the Judas Iscariot of the baroque passion plays, who haggles for his silver coins.

It is dubious whether the concept of the *Pariahvolk* can be applied even to the period from the twelfth century onward. The term refers to untouchables and in a certain sense to unredeemables; redemption by means of an anticipated migration of souls in the hereafter can be disregarded in the present context. The Jews were in contact with all strata of the population; Jewish hospitality was eagerly sought and finally made impossible only by strict ecclesiastical ordinances. In the Jewish view, the Jews were ready for the coming of the Redeemer at any time; in the Christian view, they were redeemable by conversion. However, conversion was a long way off: individual Jews converted by their own choice, others were converted under duress, but the bulk of the Jews preferred death at their own hands or the hands of killers to surrender to what in their eyes was an inferior faith. The conclusion from our deliberations thus far is that the concept of the "Pariah," outside of its Indian context, has little explanatory value.

What one can say, following Robert E. Park and Howard Becker, is that the Jews are a "marginal trading people" (Park, 1928; Becker, 1950: 109-113). Surely Park's is a "more fortunate and less ambiguous terminology" than Weber's (Weber, 1952, preface). However, here, too, caution is called for, if one compares Jews, as Howard Becker does, with Scots, Greeks, Armenians and similar ethnic groups because all that the Jews have in common with these groups is marginality. In addition, the Jews must be considered as prototypical "strangers," especially if the concept of the neighbor and the intermediary is included in the concept of the stranger. The quality of strangeness was recognized by Jews and Gentiles alike. The Jews understood themselves as living in the *Galut*, that is, in exile or in captivity; they attributed the condition in which they found themselves to the sins they had committed. The peoples in whose midst the Jews dwelled agreed: they considered the Jews as captives of the Roman Emperor and dependent on his protection or, to use the language of medieval law—spelled out in the *privilegium*

to the Jews of Worms, 1236, and the Charter of Vienna, 1237, both issued by Emperor Frederic II—as *servi camerae imperatoris* (serfs of the Imperial Chamber).The Jews were free in private law, even if they stood in need of special protection, while they were subject to the emperor and eventually to other sovereigns in public law (Kisch, 1949:131-135, 145-153; Salo W. Baron, 1962-65:IX, 136-146). The protection of the sovereign which was granted against payment, was the guarantee of their survival. But the paramount power of the Emperor declined and the rapaciousness of the minor sovereigns, including ecclesiastical rulers and municipalities, impoverished the Jews to the extent that the authorities lost interest in them and expelled them from their territories. All the larger territories were affected.

Coser, Weber and Court-Jews

The situation changed in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, gaining momentum toward the end of the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth century, and ultimately leading to the emancipation of the Jews and the granting of civic rights to them. It is incorrect and even misleading to talk as Coser does about the Court Jews, purveyors and agents of the baroque period, as if they had been "Pariahs" and in the context to confuse the concepts of the "Pariah" and the "stranger" (Coser, 1973). These self-assured and even haughty men were not "raised from the depths"; they were independent entrepreneurs with widely ramified contacts who knew how to recognize and utilize new opportunities. Of Jost Liebmann, according to Glueckel of Hameln "the richest man in Germany," it is said that he was a man of reckless energy and "imperious, self-assertive, always demanding, never asking" in his dealings with the Prussian Court, including the King (Stern, 1962: 149-50). A prime example of independence is the great Samuel Oppenheimer who did not move from Frankfurt to Vienna as a supplicant: his services were commissioned (Stern, 1950: 19 f., 25 f.; cf. Grunwald, 1913). It was he who financed the central administration and the diplomatic services of Austria, cared for the logistics of the imperial armies and made the campaigns of Prince Eugene possible. Surely, to use an expression of Max Weber, his legal status was "precarious": he had no political backing and he had to contend single-handedly with cabals and intrigues. His heirs were compelled to go into bankruptcy because the imperial treasury refused to honor its obligations. A similar fate befell other Court-Jews. They were unable to collect what their princely debtors owed them; some were imprisoned, many died in poverty (Stern, 1950: Chap. X). But the heirs of Samuel Oppenheimer met with no different fate than the firm of Fugger who two centuries earlier had earned the proverbial "gratitude of the House of Austria."

An example of the assertiveness of the Jewish money magnates is provided by the case of the Alsatian agent Cerfberr. He pointed out to the royal representative that without him the armies of the King of France could not take to the field and that he therefore should receive a *lettre-patent* which would guarantee to him the right to take up residence in the city of Strasbourg—a right which had been denied him by the city of Strasbourg until that time. The request was granted immediately (Szajkowski, 1970:298 f.; cf. Ginsburger, 1908). Cerfberr's legal status in the litigation which ensued and which lasted from 1775 until 1789 (when the Revolution disposed of quarrels of that kind) was not more "precarious" than the status of

the city. It is not without interest to note in this regard that it was at the request of Cerfberr and the instigation of Moses Mendelssohn that Christian Wilhelm Dohm wrote his famous treatise about "The Civic Improvement of the Jews" (Dohm, 1781), with a special appendix "sur la condition des Juifs en Alsace." Thus, the connection between the ideas and postulates of the Enlightenment and the *de facto* socio-economic position of the new elite becomes thoroughly translucent.

The representatives of the new elite were *shtadlanim*, that is, well-to-do men who were in regular contact with the potentates and who could use their close relations in case of emergency, such as the threat of confiscation or a decree of expulsion, in order to intervene for their endangered coreligionists. One encounters such interlocutors in Spain during the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in Poland during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. What distinguishes the Court-Jews is that they mark the emergence of an entire class of *shtadlanim* who may have been exposed individually but whose collective importance could not be overlooked. Hannah Arendt (1962:14) is correct in saying that the Court-Jews were "overprivileged" in comparison with the Christian merchants and craftsmen, and certainly in comparison with the peasants, while the poor Jewish peddlers and occasion-hunters were "underprivileged" inasmuch as they had to bear patiently with a demeaning and discriminatory treatment. The Court-Jews enjoyed special privileges, were exempted from tolls and custom duties, had access to high places (Stern, 1962:129). Two consequences follow from this situation. It was the Court-Jews who were "in the vanguard of Jewish upward mobility," not as Coser assumes their descendants and followers who merely collected the fruits. The conversion of some of the grandsons and granddaughters of Court-Jews and state bankers was a consequence of their being established at the top of the social pyramid, not a cause. It follows further from a privileged situation that the Court-Jews as *shtadlanim* were by no means "despised" and "rejected" by their poorer fellow-Jews, as Coser asserts but fails to document. The Court-Jews, with hardly an exception, were strictly observant men; it was the ignorant village Jews who permitted themselves occasional laxities. Quite a few among the Court-Jews were learned in rabbinic law and lore such as the imperial court agent Samson Wertheimer who bore the title of Chief Rabbi of Bohemia and Hungary. Others endowed religious schools and supported sacred scholarship. As a rule, they dominated the Jewish communities, some of which they even initiated although despotically in line with the life-style of the period (Stern, 1950:208 f.). The antagonism often mounting to bitter hostility encountered by the Court-Jews originated not so much with the princes but with the established estates, as in the case of Joseph Suess Oppenheimer in Stuttgart (Stern, 1929:81, 144), or with plotting Jewish competitors, as in the case of Elkan Fraenkel in Ansbach (Stern, 1950:256). The Court-Jew was indeed a servant and ally of the absolutistic state without, however, being a puppet or even a "Pariah" in the sight of the ruler.

The degree to which the life-style of the Baroque was the common property of the courtly and the Jewish elite is illuminated by the story of the marriage of one of the daughters of Glueckel of Hameln and the son of the wealthy Elia Cleve, a subject of the Elector of Brandenburg (Glueckel of Hameln, 1962:77-80). Prince Moritz von Nassau and Prince Frederick, later King Frederick I of Prussia, the latter then but 13 years of age, requested to be invited to the sumptuous celebra-

tion. Glueckel relates with a Jewish mother's prideful satisfaction that the princely guest held the hand of her five year old son in an admiring and caressing manner throughout the proceedings. The gathering at Cleve was a meeting of almost equals, foreshadowing a juridically more formalized equality.

In this context, more precisely in the course of the discussion about the origin of modern capitalism, we are to meet with the Weberian "Pariah" concept for the last time. As is well-known, Max Weber (1961:264; 1968:611-617) contrasts the continuing and rationally conducted "bourgeois" enterprise with the politically secured commercial and financial operations of the Jews, which he terms " 'Pariah'-capitalism." The factuality of the observation need not be doubted, but the following must be added: 1) a statement of this kind comes suspiciously near to the protonazistic contradistinction of "schaffendes" (creative) and "raffendes" (rapacious) capital, of which one is supposedly "Aryan" and the other "Semitic" in origin; 2) the disparaging term "Pariah-capitalism" fails to do justice to the economic role of the Jews. Max Weber himself has pointed to the development of modern bureaucracy, especially of an orderly financial management, as the prerequisite for, and accompaniment of the development of modern capitalism. The Jewish contribution to that development through the Court-Jews and the state bankers, who are their successors, cannot be gainsaid. Beyond that, one must think of the emergence of joint-stock banks in Europe, especially in Berlin, Paris, Brussels, Vienna and Munich, institutions which in all those places owe their existence to the initiative and the capital investment of private Jewish bankers; this development of modern capitalism. The Jewish contribution to that development throws into proper relief the somewhat too generalizing, quasi-ideal-typical contention that Jewish merchants have failed to participate in the build-up of "continuing enterprises." To be sure, Jewish participation was delayed, for reasons that cannot be elaborated at this point. What can be said is that the *Bayerische Hypoteken- und Wechselbank* which was founded in 1835 with 65% of the capital investment coming from Jewish sources, continues until this very day (Lestschinsky, 1932:27-28).

The Pariah as a State of Mind

Hannah Arendt's conception of the Pariah (1966:56-58) is a different matter altogether. She touches only lightly on the question whether or not, or to what degree, the Jews are a "*Pariahvolk*," although she seems to agree with the eighteenth-century writer Johann Jacob Schudt that individual Jews might attain "happiness" and exert considerable influence on account of their wealth, but that the Jews "considered as a *corpo*" are disregarded because they are "strangers everywhere" and are lacking sovereignty (Arendt, 1966:24-25; Schudt, 1715-1717:I, 19). The important consideration at this point is that Hannah Arendt's pariahs emerge only in the nineteenth century and that they are a particular class of Jews. From the middle ages up to the period of the emancipation, the leadership of the Jewish community had shifted from rabbinical scholars to pious men of wealth, but Jews had taken themselves for granted throughout the shifting constellations. However, in the nineteenth century, two rival elites appeared in sharp contrast, the parvenus and the pariahs. The parvenus are the financial magnates, the monied upstarts, who in the benign climate of the liberal era continue to be concerned with public finance and speculative venture; the pariahs are the new class—or anti-class—of the intellectuals, the journalists, the

critics, the free-lance writers. The parvenus are upstarts in the eyes of onlookers while the pariahs are outcasts in their own eyes. To be a pariah in this sense is a state of mind. The monied aristocrats knew how to help themselves and the average Jew never intended to leave the fold. But those intellectuals who separated themselves from the community of Israel, but were not accepted in the larger community as anything else but Jews presented a problem. Indeed, some of them, like Michael Beer, author of a dramatic play entitled "The Pariah," saw themselves in the role of Indian Untouchables (Kahn, 1967). Ludwig Boerne (1786-1837) explained the emotional state of these men and women perceptively, when he confessed about himself that "some accuse me of being a Jew, others forgive me for being a Jew, still others praise me for it, but all of them reflect on it" (Arendt, 1966:64; quoted acc. to L. Boerne's *Briefe aus Paris*, 74th Letter, Febr. 1832). Surely his desire of being considered a human being pure and simple could not be granted. Hence he and those like him were floating between the camps as true outcasts, that is, as belonging to no caste or class. Theirs was marginality with a vengeance. Under the conditions created by the emancipation, the "stranger" had become a "marginal man." A more accurate description of the marginal intellectuals would be the one of "frustrated escapists" (Cahnman, 1958). They were unable to escape, yet unwilling to return. A statement of this kind is a melancholy postscript to the perennial accusation of Jewish "self-segregation."

Conclusion: Jews and Governments

The foregoing deliberations are preliminary to the understanding of the relations between Jews and government. The medieval theory and practice of *servitus Judaeorum* relates the Jews primarily to the central power of the *imperium* and secondarily to the delegated power of the territorial sovereigns. The nineteenth century has retained that relationship, but has modified it in essential points. The *Millet*-like autonomy of the Jewish communities was abolished and replaced by the principle of citizenship, that is, by unified law with equal rights and obligations for all. The conception which the Jews had of themselves as living in *Galut* had to be abandoned. To Napoleon's incisive question to the Jewish delegates assembled in the Paris *Sanhedrin*, whether the Jews of France considered France as their fatherland and Frenchmen as their brothers, the delegates replied: "*La France est notre patrie, les Français sont nos frères*" (Anchel, 1928:173). In the "Notes" to his question, Napoleon referred to the consequences of Titus' capture of Jerusalem as a thing of the past and he ended with the significant assurance that he wanted the Jews "to find in France a new Jerusalem" (Thompson, 1934:158).

These sentences mark profound alterations in the status of the Jews, but in another view they hardly affected the relations between the Jews and the state. The Jewish state bankers, with the House of Rothschild as a protagonist, became the mainstay of the inter-European system of governments, so much so that Prince Metternich could indicate to the Viennese Rothschilds: "If I should go to the dogs, you would go with me" (Arendt, 1966:25). Jews everywhere became fervent patriots, attached more to the state than to the nation, because they knew that they owed their emancipation to governmental *fiat* in the face of popular reluctance. When, later in the nineteenth century, the Jews were confronted with antisemitic movements, they referred to their quality as citizens, as they had formerly referred to their special privileges, and to the obligation of governments

to protect them in their constitutional rights. However, when in the aftermath of World War I the state was taken over by a totalitarian party, and especially by the N.S.D.A.P. as a racist party, the state had been reduced to being the executor of racist policies. Herewith the point was reached where the very fact that the Jews were patriotic citizens came to count against them. They continued to rely on a protector who turned out to be a prostrate image of his former self. The state had ceased to be the arbiter of social forces and the guarantor of internal peace. If the Party-State as a racial agent was to crush the challengers of the master-race, the Jews who were considered the arch-challengers and the very incarnation of the counter-race, were faced with an implacable foe. Even with the deadly racial component removed, it remains likely that the Party-State will have to consider the organized Jewish community as a community of "strangers." The concept of the "stranger" includes the concept of marginality which has been developed from it and to which the concept of the "Pariah" in Hannah Arendt's (but not in Max Weber's) sense can be reduced. To be sure, the "stranger" is an outsider who may become a foe. However, if he is permitted to be an intermediary, he can be a neighbor, a friend, a helper and healer.

REFERENCES

Anchel, Robert. 1928. Napoleon et les Juifs; essai sur les rapports de l'état français et du culte israelite de 1806 à 1815. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

Arendt, Hannah. 1966. The Origins of Totalitarianism. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Baron, Salo W. 1962-65. A Social and Religious History of the Jews, IX. New York: Columbia University Press.

Becker, Howard. 1950. Through Values to Social Interpretation. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.

Brentano, Lujo. 1923. Der wirtschaftende Mensch in der Geschichte. Leipzig: F. Meiner.

Cahnman, Werner J. 1958. "The Frustrated Escapist." *Reconstructionist* Vol. XXIV, 2:15-20.

1964. "Religion and Nationality." Pp. 271-280 in W. J. Cahnman and A. Boskoff (eds.), *Sociology and History*. New York: Free Press.

1965. "Role and Significance of the Jewish Artisan Class." *The Jewish Journal of Sociology* VII, 2:207-12

Coser, Lewis A. 1972. "The Alien as a Servant of Power." *Amerian Sociological Review* 37, 5:574-581.

Dohm, Christian Wilhelm. 1781. Ueber die buergerliche Verbesserung der Juden. Berlin und Stettin, first ed.

Dubois, J.A. and Beauchamp, Henry K. 1897. Hindu Manners, Customs and Ceremonies. Oxford: Clarendon.

Fuchs, Stephen. 1950. The Children of Hari. Vienna: Herder.

Ginsburger, Moses. 1908. Cerfberr et son époque. Guebwiller.

Glueckel of Hameln. 1962. The Life of Glueckel of Hameln, 1646-1724, written by herself. Tr. and ed. by Beth Zion Abrahams. London: East and West Library.

Grunwald, M. 1913. Samuel Oppenheimer und sein Kreis: Ein Kapitel aus der Finanzgeschichte Oesterreichs. Vienna and Leipzig: (Quellen und Forschungen der Geschichte der Juden in Deutsch-Oesterreich), 1913.

Gumplowicz, Ludwig. 1883. Der Rassenkampf. Innsbruck: Wagner.

Guttman, Julius. 1925. "Max Webers Soziologie des Judentums." *Monatschrift fuer Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 69, 7/8:195-223.

Hempel, Carl G. 1952. "Problems of Concept and Theory Formation in the Social Sciences." Pp. 71 ff. in *Science, Language and Human Rights*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kahn, Lothar. 1967. "Michael Beer (1800-1833)". *Yearbook of the Leo Baeck Institute*, XII:149-160.

Kisch, Guido. 1949. The Jews in Medieval Germany—A study of their legal and social status. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lestschinsky, Jakob. 1932. Das wirtschaftliche Schicksal des deutschen Judentums. Berlin: Zentral-wohlfahrtsstelle der deutschen Juden und Hauptstelle fuer juedische Wanderfuersorge.

Mommsen, Theodor. 1885. Roemische Geschichte, Vol. V, XI: Judaea und die Juden. Berlin: Weidmann.

Park, Robert E. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33, 6:881-893.

Schudt, Johann Jacob. 1715-17. Juedische Merkwuerdigkeiten. Frankfurt a. M.: I, first ed.

Simmel, Georg. 1950. The Sociology of Georg Simmel. Tr. and ed. by Kurt Wolff. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

Stammer, Otto. 1972. Max Weber and Sociology Today. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

Stern, Selma. 1929. Jud Suess. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

1950. The Court Jew. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

1962. Der Preussische Staat und die Juden. Part I. Tuebingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

Szajkowski, Zosa. 1970. Jews and the French Revolutions of 1789, 1830 and 1848. New York: Ktav.

Thurston, Edgar and Rangachari, K. 1909. Castes and Tribes of Southern India. Vol. VI. Madras: Government Press.

Thompson, James M. (Tr. and ed.). 1934. Napoleon Self-Revealed in Three Hundred Letters. Boston and New York: Houghton-Mifflin.

Toennies, Ferdinand. 1957. Community and Society. Tr. and ed. by Chas. P. Loomis. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

1971. On Sociology: Pure, Applied and Empirical. Tr. and ed. by Werner J. Cahnman and Rudolf Heberle. Chicago: University of Chicago Pressss.

Weber, Max. 1952. Ancient Judaism. Tr. and ed. by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

1958. The Religion of India. The Sociology of Hinduism and Buddhism. Tr. and ed. by Hans H. Gerth and Don Martindale. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press.

1961. General Economic History. Tr. by Frank H. Knight. New York: Collier Books.

1968. Economy and Society. 3 Vols. Ed. by Guenther Roth and Hans Wittich. New York: Bedminster Press.

Zuckerman, Arthur J. 1970. "The Political Uses of Theology: The Conflict of Bishop Agobard and the Jews of Lyon." *Western Michigan University Studies of Medieval Culture* III:23-51.